

MEETING	Monday, April 27, 2015 Sullivan Chamber
TIME	5:36 PM
PRESIDING OFFICER	Mayor David P. Maher
PRESENT	Mayor Maher, Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons and Toomey
PRESENTATIONS PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	None
MOMENT OF MEDITATION	For the earthquake in Nepal and the victims

MAYOR ANNOUNCED THAT THE MEETING WAS BEING RECORDED WITH AUDIO AND VISUAL DEVICES.

SUBMISSION OF THE RECORD

On motion of Councillor Simmons the submission of the Minutes for the March 30, 2015 Regular City Council Meeting; the April 6, 2015 Roundtable/Working Meeting and the April 10, 2015 Special City Council Meeting were accepted on a voice vote of five members.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Charlotte Watson, Cambridge Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that she supports Mass + Main. She stated that this is the right thing to do and is a necessary effort to help secure the city's future as a successful community. She stated that she is a resident, an African American and a property owner. She stated that as a property owner she has chosen to make her rental unit affordable. She stated that maintaining Cambridge's diversity in challenging times keeps Cambridge exciting, creative, and vibrant and a welcoming hometown. She stated that Cambridge has lost community members because rents rose so much that they were no longer affordable. She stated that the City should control the development and allow it to flourish the way that we want it to be with all levels of income, local business, safety to the community and a partner with a reputable business that wants to secure and advance the future of Cambridge.

Ilan Levy, 148 Spring Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated that in the last few months there has been an increase in campaign contributions from people affiliated with the Normandy/Twining petition. He stated that for the integrity of the process it is essential these appearances of impropriety be lifted. He urged the City Councillors to never accept and to return any contributions to their campaign that might create these appearances.

Amanda Tramont, 3 Dana Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated her strong support for the Mass + Main mixed income housing sub district which will create housing, not lab or office space, along Massachusetts Avenue and Columbia Street. She stated that she has attended the community meetings and has seen the models and renderings of the project. She noted that she read the proposal and she believes that housing and retail will be a tremendous improvement to that block. She stated that the

affordable housing that the developer has offered is a compelling community benefit. She stated that the time to act is now.

Carolyn Shipley, 15 Laurel Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. She asked that the City Council let the Twining up zoning petition expire without a vote. She stated that if the City approves the developer's petition now for a non-conforming height for a building in Central Square that will lead to another developer wanting to build another tall building and so on. She stated that she would like a plan for Central Square and asked about the public discourse on the C2 Report. She asked why this is not put on the City Council agenda. She asked why there are no neighborhood meetings for the neighborhoods that would be affected by the tall buildings in Central Square. She stated that many of her Cambridgeport neighbors have told her that they do not want tall buildings without a plan.

Kasper H. Bejoian Jr., 544 Huron Avenue, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated that he is in favor of this proposal. He asked that the City Council vote yes for the Normandy/Twining Mass and Main proposal to bring much needed affordable housing to Central Square. He stated his support and noted that it is important for the city to have a project such as this one. He stated that this is a vast improvement and a tremendous addition.

Richard Clarey, 15 Brookford Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated that it is easy to find out who will be receiving the special gift from the City Council. He stated that Normandy took advantage of the fact that rent stable apartments become market apartments if they get the tenants out. The Attorney General in New York sued Normandy for the harassment and one year ago the Attorney General assessed them \$1 million in damages for various violations. He stated that they boast about these violations on their website. He stated that the City Council is about to give an extraordinary amount of wealth to people that do not deserve it.

Laurie Friedman, 33 Essex Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that given the overwhelming consensus that new construction in Central Square should prioritize affordable housing. She stated that it seems that the main disagreement is the question of how best to accomplish this. She questioned if the Normandy/Twining is the best that can be done. She stated that she believes the answer is no. She stated that there are a variety of odd parcels in Central Square used for parking. She noted that some are owned by the City and others by developers. She stated that she lives on a block with a large lot on the corner of Prospect and Bishop Allen owned by Intercontinental. She stated that they floated development on one side of Prospect Street while keeping parking on the other. She stated that this is a waste of precious space. Regarding the 10 Essex Street development, she stated that this is already approved and abuts the City parking lot on Essex and Bishop Allen Drive. She stated that if C2 zoning had been discussed and implemented this project would have been improved. She stated that Mass + Main is one of many development projects that need to be considered in a wiser, larger picture way in Central Square. She stated that the developers want to maximize their profits but she stated that the real estate market in Cambridge is not going to tank and we do not need to worry about developers losing money. She stated that the City Council has the moral responsibility to achieve the most good for all residents of the city. She noted the need for limits to profits and compromises to some things. She stated that everyone agrees that more affordable housing is needed and that the market forces, if left alone, will gut the City of working and middle class residents. She stated that Central Square is not lacking in residential density. She noted that the businesses and people who live in Central Square need parking and access to sustainable transportation. She stated that developers like Normandy need some zoning requirements and financial incentives to build below ground parking and preserve some of the space for open public uses as well as provide affordable housing. She stated that Councillor Carlone's

proposal was offered in the hope that people would open their minds to the possibilities of everyone winning something with better, clearer zoning, better design and a public/private partnership for use of the city parking lots, more affordable housing, lower heights, access to public open space, varied, enlivening commercial space and appropriate parking for cars and car sharing and bikes. She stated that this required the leadership of the City Council and city planning. She asked that the City Council allow the Normandy petition to expire without a vote. She asked that the policy be set for the entire community and not just on developer.

Carolyn Fuller, 12 Douglas Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that she lives in the heart of Central Square and is in the shadow of these proposed buildings. She stated that the City Council will hear from many about how much they appreciate the prospect of 47 new below market rate units. She stated that she is pleased to get these units in the neighborhood but there is much more to this project. She stated that she is a supporter of the project because she believes this is an historic moment where we can either embrace significant new housing developments in the core cities near public transportation or continue to push development to exurbia, building ever more McMansions in our bedroom communities and putting more cars onto superhighways. She stated that Mass + Main will serve as housing for the tech workers of tomorrow. She asked if the city wants its public transit overcrowded with ever higher numbers of voters clambering for improvements or do we want these same people clambering for bigger and bigger super highways. She stated that she welcomes the 21st century factory workers into her backyard because she wants a cleaner environment for her grandchildren. She added that this project will mean that she and her husband will have to replace plants in their garden with plants that need more shade.

Bill McAvinney, 12 Douglass Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated that this is within the district of Mass + Main. He spoke in support of this project. He stated that there is a housing crisis in Cambridge. He stated that when we keep housing development to a minimum we tell people that we do not have room for them. As a homeowner, he stands to increase the dollar value of his property substantially but he values the social value of his home. He stated that Cambridge has a tradition of tolerance and welcoming diversity. He stated that he believes we can save economic diversity by building this and other housing developments. He stated that ugly name calling is the road to ruining the city. He stated that this is one of the best places for dense housing. He supports this project as a way to preserve affordable housing in the city.

Nina Dillon, Mothers Out Front, stated that two weeks ago she saw James Hanson speak at MIT. She stated that Mothers Out Front has taken care to schedule individual meetings with the City Councillors. She stated that Cambridge can lead the way by switching from municipal electricity to renewable. She stated that climate scientists do not have the power to change things. They only have the power to inform us. She stated that the City Council has the power to change things. She asked the City Council to match their response to what science is demanding.

Elizabeth Adams, 31 Donnell Street, spoke on City Manager Agenda Item #3. She stated that she is a member of Mothers Out Front and she wants them to know that she did something to protect their future. She stated that Cambridge is showing bold action in climate leadership. She stated that they are a growing movement. She noted that they had 100 people who made the switch. Two months later there are 150 people. She stated that Cambridge can play a historic role in leading other cities and towns.

Kristine Jelstrup, 120 Pleasant Street, spoke on City Manager Agenda #3. She stated that she has been active in environmental movements for decades. She stated that when her son asks her what the grownups are doing to mitigate this crisis, she is pleased to say that Cambridge is acting. She stated that Cambridge can start a chain reaction in Massachusetts. She stated that the time has come for Cambridge to be out front. She questioned that if Cambridge does not act, who will.

Eli Yarden, 143 Pleasant Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated that since he is concerned about the physical realities to know that human beings are an aspect of the reality. He asked who studies concerns and the systems, physical and social, that are involved. He asked these questions of real estate developers and has yet to receive a response. He stated that of course residents are secondary. He stated that the City Council indicated that it did not wish to usurp the authority of the Planning Board but has been negotiating changes regarding what zoning will be acceptable to a sufficient number of the councillors. The only way to find out what is happening is in a court of law.

Richard Klibaner, 54 Western Avenue, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated that he has lived and worked in Central Square for thirty years. He support the Mass + Main petition. He stated that Patrick Verbeke, 91 Sidney Street, spoke on Committee Report #2.

Jan Devereaux, 255 Lakeview Avenue, spoke on Policy Orders #8 and 13. She asked the City Council to vote for a less auto-dependent future and not to maintain the status quo.

Steve Kaiser, 191 Hamilton Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He offered a word of sympathy for the Planning Board. He stated that he has been critical in the past but they have an almost impossible upcoming agenda. He asked how anyone can be expected to understand zoning language and have it written in such a manner that everyone can understand it. He stated that the building is fundamentally ugly. He stated that we need to tell the architect to come up with a plan that is a beautiful building. We need to do work on the incentives in this zoning. He stated that there cannot be giveaways. He proposed readjustment of parcels. You do not need up zoning to do this project. He stated that he wants to get the housing, transportation and transit right.

David Chilinski, 221 Hampshire Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated that he would like to speak in support of the Twining petition. He stated that in reviewing the underlying zoning which would allow a very bulky, almost 100,000 square foot office/commercial development on this site, he believes that this residential approach is much better for the community. He stated that as opposed to 300 workers finding their way to the city every day by car or train, Central Square would benefit from the street life and vibrancy that 300 people living in the city will provide. He stated that area merchants and restaurants will benefit from this infusion of people on the street throughout the week. He stated that the height and scale of this building, while not currently found in the area, is appropriate for this very important focal point along Mass and Main from an urban design perspective. He stated that unprecedented affordable approach that Twining has taken on this site demonstrates a clear understanding of the most challenging issue that is before the community and sets the tone for future developments to consider. He asked the City Council to vote in favor of this petition.

Carol Bellew, 257 Charles Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated her support for the Mass + Main. She stated that she wants to dispel rumors. She stated that the building is 2/3 the size of the courthouse and it is all housing. She stated that the Courthouse was all office. These buildings cannot be compared. She stated that the Twining building is needed desperately in Central Square. She stated that they are offering retail on the first floor which is what the city is asking of all the developers in East

Cambridge to do. She stated that development starts the ball rolling and moves things forward in a way that Central Square has never seen before. She stated that Central Square deserves a good building for residential and that it can be a key building in the Square for future development. She stated that if the other buildings are doing commercial and retail then this is a welcome addition to the square.

Ben Roopenin, 3 Dana Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated his support for the Mass + Main project. He stated that it is important to maintain diversity in development. He urged the City Council to pass the proposal.

Richard Krushnic, 20 Oak Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He spoke in opposition to the Mass + Main petition. He stated that spot zoning undermines general zoning and opens the door for spot zoning in the future. He stated that it is important for Central Square to make sense organically and in the larger scale. He stated that he admires from an urban design perspective much of what he sees in Europe. That is the proper mix of residential and commercial development. He stated that this project cuts the sun off from Area 4. He stated that if you allow spot zoning for a project such as this, how is it possible to say no to the next project that comes along. He stated that if you really want to see diversity, the City Council would have already increased the linkage fees. He stated that if the City Council wants to preserve diversity, the city has all the money to do a good job of it.

Jo Solet, 15 Berkeley Street, spoke on Policy Order #7. She stated that she supports this policy order. She stated that noise is a public health issue. We do not need to trade quality of life for prosperity. She stated the need to take a more proactive approach. She stated that a reporting system should be set up and resources to follow-up and find violators.

Michael Hawley, 101 Third Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He spoke in opposition to the Normandy/Twining petition. He stated that this is not a City of Cambridge petition to change zoning, it originated from the developer. He stated that good planning is to plan first and zoning to implement the plan. In this instance we will get better result urging the developer to work with the City to help iron out the Master Plan. He stated that he is one of the plaintiffs in the appeal against the Courthouse. He stated that planning is one of the most important things and letting developers rewrite zoning is wrong.

Larry Ward, 372 Broadway, stated that he has lived in Cambridge for over 27 years. He stated that he has never seen a project that is going to provide 20% more housing than any other project that has been brought to the city. He stated his support for this petition. He stated that what we have to understand given the current real estate situation in Cambridge is the fact that if we do not have new development for affordable housing, we lose the economic and social diversity. He stated that to talk about wanting diversity, people come first and Cambridge has always been a place where we strive to put people first. This project will put many people in affordable housing units. He urged the City Council to vote for this petition.

Charles Teague, 23 Edmunds Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated that he would like the current version of the Normandy/Twining up-zoning to expire. He stated that there are many alternatives that are better for Cambridge and still pretty great for developers. He stated that the bizarrely belated Carlone alternative followed C2 principles but the Normandy has failed to follow. He stated examples of such as incorporating a larger area, incorporating a city parking lot, replacing surface parking with garage parking and producing nearly three times the affordable housing. He stated that he does not disagree with many C2 conclusions but he remembers the late Brian Murphy addressing the

room after final recommendations. He stated that he told the attendees that the C2 document was not the end but the start of a very long and very public process. He stated that the developer has been well aware of the process and the length of the process. He stated that a Master Plan would be even better but that is years away and if everyone works together, Central Square could be finished in months.

Esther Hanig, 136 Pine Street spoke on Committee Report #2. She expressed her support for the Normandy/Twining petition. She stated that as housing continues to skyrocket, the addition that this project will bring cannot be more important. She stated that the City is in desperate need of additional housing and she urged the City Council to move this proposal forward so that additional housing will be created as soon as possible. She stated that the best thing about this development is the inclusion of 47 additional units of affordable housing. She stated that she is grateful for the responsiveness of the developers to increase the number of affordable units to help meet this pressing need. She stated that she has heard concerns about the fact that the building height is greater than that proposed by the C2 Committee. She stated that as a member of that committee she was a participant in conversation with fellow members about concerns that the proposed density was insufficient given housing and construction costs to adequately incent developers to build the affordable housing that is so important. She stated that this is not about one development but about what kind of city she wants to live in. She stated that this development will provide desperately needed affordable units in a location that will provide access to public transportation, promote walking and biking to work and play and provide a market for the kind of retail neighbors are currently lacking.

Andrea Wilder, 12 Arlington Street spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that the proposed Twining building is an abomination. It is too high. It does not serve the people of Central Square. It also does not serve low and moderate income in Cambridge who need housing. She stated that this is the time to deep six the present Twining petition and let it expire without a vote.

Ken Reeves, Harvard Street, stated that the issue of what goes up in Central Square means a lot to him. He stated that this is a proposal to building something 2 ½ times bigger than what is allowed under current zoning. He stated that he is not against the proposal but this building is very big. He stated that there is a mythology that if this does not get built, there will never be housing built again. He does not buy into this thinking. He stated that he is looking for community benefits and he looks to the City Council to represent him. He stated that this will have tremendous impact on parking. He asked where the community benefits are. He stated that if you change the landscape, then the question is, "What are you doing for me?" He stated that this will make millions of dollars and there are not millions in the community benefit piece. He stated that the system that we have is that people donate money to elected officials. He stated that people are allowed to donate to a campaign and that is how people get elected.

Lee Farris, 269 Norfolk Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that she really wants to see more affordable housing in more human buildings. She stated that she agrees that there is an affordable housing crisis. She stated that we do not have to rely on developers to provide it. She stated that she does not agree with everything in C2 but she feels the need for resolution. She stated that the proposed FAR is unprecedented in Central Square. She asked the City Council to let this petition expire. If we all work together we can get far greater community benefits. She stated that she would like Normandy to build within the laws.

Juliette Blackett, 30 Churchill Avenue, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that as a forty-year resident of Cambridge she has watched with dismay the deterioration of sensible planning throughout

the city, particularly the underhanded use of Special Permits for the enrichment of greedy developers currying favor with politicians who are more interested in their own careers than the healthy growth of the city. She stated her opposition to the Twining/Normandy project in Central Square as it is now proposed. She stated that the city cannot allow this manipulation of zoning regulations and Special Permit planning fiasco to continue. She stated that it always ends up encouraging developers to curry favor with the City Council members, the Planning Board, and other government departments to the detriment of neighborhood concerns and preservation. She urged the City Council to rethink this project. She stated that as a citizen, leverage lies with the representatives that she chooses to vote for. She stated that the people who make the planning decisions are appointed and are not elected. She stated that angry confrontation is unproductive.

Paul Dennis, 156 Cherry Street spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated that he believes that the Cambridge residents and families will occupy the space more effectively than an office or laboratory will. He stated that he knows that office space cannot offer the same benefit as residential. He stated he decided to speak in support of the project because of the affordable units that will help confront the affordable housing crisis.

Kathy Watkins, 80 Fawcett Street spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that she lives in affordable housing and has advocated for it for many years. She stated that there needs to be a balance of green space, sky views from the ground and some peace and quiet. She stated that the Normandy project is 80% luxury units. She stated that working within the system of profit-driven developers is a losing matter. She stated that this kind of development is unsustainable for the current residents. She stated that Cambridge is being turned into a place where mostly very wealthy and some very poor will be able to live. She stated that she does not think that height, which blocks off a residential neighborhood is appropriate even if it were all affordable housing. She stated that the City Council should not pass this petition.

Emilia Arimah, 22 Lopez Avenue spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that she is a product of Cambridge and she would love her family to grow up in Cambridge. She stated that she has been chronically homeless for a number of years. She stated that it is important to take the time to do things right. She stated that affordable housing is joke. She stated that there are a lot of semantics going on. She stated that it is tarrying not having a place to live. She stated that she has lived in her car and on couches and the issue is real. This is an opportunity to have something sooner than later. She stated that her concerns are that her son is fed and he has clothes on his back.

Elizabeth McNally, 31 Lawrence Street spoke on Policy Order #8. She stated that an improvement for one group of citizens should not create a disadvantage for another group. She stated that the permanent loss of 3-4 parking spaces on Lawrence Street represents a major disadvantage. She stated that the problem will be further exacerbated in the winter time. She stated that the Human Services Commission promotes activities that enhance the quality of life for Cambridge residents. She asked the City Council to keep in mind the quality of life for both car riders and bike riders. She noted that in many cases, residents are both. She stated that to say there is widespread or general support for Hubway stations does not address the local impact of each Hubway station. She stated that residents of Lawrence Street were not notified that a Hubway station would be installed on their street. She stated that Lawrence Street residents have been told that a permanent location on Lawrence Street is the plan but it is a plan that reduces parking and increases unsafe behavior.

Sam Seidel spoke in support of Mass + Main. He stated that the jobs of the planners is to look at the tools of today and tomorrow and then build strategy that will bring outcomes that we want. One of the issues in that the 21st century is presenting a new set of challenges. He stated that he worries that what he hears from other proposals is that they will not meet the goals that the City wants. He stated that over the last thirty years the City invested in jobs. What we have not done is invest in the community of which housing is a piece. That is the place that we need to focus on. He stated that we have to figure out what the community will look like in the 21st century. He stated that as it relates to linkage, these challenges are massive. He stated that we need to have more confidence in the future to solve these problems in real ways.

Jimmy Tingle, 27 Lawrence Street, spoke on Policy Order #8. He stated that last year there was Hubway station placed on Lawrence Street. He stated that they have been told that it is coming back to Lawrence Street. He stated that a residential, one-way heavily congested street is not the best place to put a Hubway station. He stated that he supports a permanent Dana Park location for a Hubway station.

Sue Butler, 14 Clinton Street, spoke on Policy Orders #2 and #3. She stated that she helped Mothers Out Front have a meeting with the City Manager and she was moved by the seriousness by which he took his job to fulfill this matter. She stated that there are a number of things on living in a lively city. She thanked the City Council for all its doing and thanked the Mothers Out Front for their work.

Barbara Rodriguez, 140 Columbia Street spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that she supports the Mass + Main proposal as currently modified. She stated that when she moved into her building it was an apartment building. She stated that she sold it for money and it is now a single family living in a 5-story building. She stated that the real estate brokers are going to continue selling properties. She stated that she is in favor of luxury housing. She stated that more and more people want to move to Cambridge.

Robin Lapidus, Central Square Business Association, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that the Mass + Main petition is critical to the future of Central Square. She stated that the business community has made a big impact leading up to this meeting. She stated that the voices of the businesses have been heard and their efforts have been met with a favorable recommendation to move the Mass + Main petition to the City Council this evening where another vote will be taken. She stated that a vote for the Mass + Main petition at this meeting will mean a mix of new, lively, necessary retail along Massachusetts Avenue in an area that is currently a large inactive space with a mix of housing with approximately 230 residential units and 47 permanently and privately subsidized affordable housing units. She stated that this project will add neighbors who will be invested in the Central Square community and will help to create a sense of place in the fabric of Central Square's Main Street. She stated that this project brings an invested property owner who can and will contribute to making Central Square active, safe and welcoming to all. She stated that the project is aligned with the public processes that the CSBA has participated in over the past several years.

Alec Papazian, 105 Norfolk Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated his support for the Mass + Main petition. He stated that waiting for a plan that may come to fruition in two years does nothing to help the problem that the city is facing. The City has failed to increase affordable housing and this petition is doing more.

Scott M. Hoffman, 137 South Street, Boston, spoke on Policy Order #11. He spoke regarding the preservation of the postal service. The postal service has entered into a deal with Staples to provide

postal service. The public has not been notified. The bottom line is the last time the UPS tried to pluck offices from the community it failed. They have now entered into an unholy alliance with Staples. He asked for City Council support.

Ellin Sarot, 22 Hews Street, thanked Councillors Kelley and McGovern for Policy Order #7. She stated her support for this order. She stated that regarding the Normandy/Twining project, she is on the CHA waiting list. She is disabled. She thinks that affordable housing is needed but she does not think the Normandy/Twining project is the answer. She stated that Cambridge has changed in the time she has lived here. She stated that having “the Hulk” in Central Square sets a bad precedent. She stated that her rent is almost twice what she was paying previously. She stated her support for the postal workers.

Olivia Fiske, 131 Magazine Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that many aspects of this development are based directly on the C2K2 project. She stated that this property is on a commercial street at a major intersection. She stated that she feels that this is a good place for a tall building. She stated that she appreciates the outreach by the Twining/Normandy team and noted that her interactions with them have been responsive to the issues of the community.

Marge Amster, McTernan Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that she is a member of the Cambridgeport Neighborhood Association where they saw the latest sketch of the project. She stated that the developer has listened to the feedback. She stated her support for the Normandy/Twining proposal to build additional housing in Central Square, both “affordable” as well as market rate. She stated her support for a tall building at this site. She stated that she cares more about what happens on the first two floors of the building when she walks by than how high the building eventually goes. She urged the City Council to vote favorable on this project.

Marilee Meyer, 10 Dana Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that this is premature to the master planning. She stated that planning for Central Square is not finished. The developer is asking for permanent legislation. She stated that the City Council has the power to dictate lab districts. She stated that we need more affordable housing but to dangle a carrot to play on fear and desperation is unconscionable. She stated that there are other ways to look for affordable housing. She stated that we need to plan a moratorium until a fair Master Plan can define what is needed. The developer should not wag the City Council. She stated that the process has morphed into a stacked system which needs to be investigated.

Hubert Murray, 204 Erie Street, stated that he is in support of Mass + Main. He stated that he is still in favor of this project and that the affordable housing is a critical process and a chronic issue and we have to address it. He stated that he is supportive of the mixed uses in the proposal. The massing of the building has been greatly improved.

Patrick Barrett, 234 Broadway, stated his support for the Twining/Normandy project. He stated that as a member of the C2 committee he endeavored to help put Central Square on a path ahead of development. He stated that he is pleased that the developer has kept true to the vision 21 volunteers, business owners, developers, parents and residents set out on. He stated that it is no coincidence that the city is also discussing things such as linkage in tandem to the zoning debate currently at hand. He asked the City Council to consider the math associated with what we tax commercial developments with versus what residential buildings must contend with. He asked the City Council to approve the petition so that the landscape of Central Square can be created and restored.

Mark Boyes-Watson, 100 Pacific Street, spoke on Committee Report #2. He stated that he supports the Mass + Main zoning petition. He stated that he is familiar with the challenges and opportunities that development in the square brings and with the ideas and aspirations that came out of the long and public committee process and the Community Development Department's subsequent report. He stated that this project is broadly consistent with the goals established in the C2 process and would be a small step in the right direction for the City Council to advance the Mass + Main petition and permit the proposed housing to be built.

Marilyn Wellons, 651 Green Street, spoke on Applications and Petitions #3. She spoke against all of the banners at 30 Brattle Street. She stated that this has been a pattern for signs and noted the failure of enforcement. She stated that regarding Policy Order #7, this is a well thought out approach to dealing with the problem of noise pollution. She stated that regarding Committee Report #2, she stated the implicit threat of this project is that if you do not allow this there will be labs there. She stated that labs include noise and light pollution. She stated that there are some labs that are able to address this issue but not all labs will do this. She stated that Normandy/Twining needs more work.

Hasson Rashid, 820 Massachusetts Avenue, stated that social planning should include that the City of Cambridge is committed to ending poverty. He stated that the citywide planning process should mirror goals of the consolidated and action plans with a ten-year plan blueprint to end homelessness goals. He stated that the Foundry Building is an existing structure that can be renovated and rehabilitated to serve as affordable housing. He stated that the City should assign or donate the Foundry Building to one of its municipal agencies and allow it to take charge of making the Foundry Building properties suitable for serving the homeless population.

Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street, stated that the Noise Ordinance needs to be made enforceable. She stated that as it relates to 30 Brattle Street, she commended the Planning Board because they got it right. She stated that she hopes the City Council will not make it easy for the applicants. She stated that at some point humans cannot distinguish noise anymore. She urged the City Council to vote this down. She stated that regarding Mass + Main, the real question is whether we sell it for cheap or whether we get something good out of it. She stated that there is not enough time to do a good job.

Phyllis Bretholtz stated that she is worried about the up zoning and that the Twining will set precedent for future development. She stated that she has taken photos of every building in Central Square and the tallest building is 9 stories. The scale of this project is way out of scale for the rest of Central Square. She supports the need for affordable housing and a Master Plan. She does not want a 19-story building.

Susanne Schlossberg, 61 Bishop Allen Drive, spoke on Committee Report #2. She stated that she is a resident right behind the proposed building. She stated that these parking lots bring no value to the Central Square area. She stated that 20% affordable housing is not enough. She stated that there are 4 empty parking lots during the weekends on Bishop Allen Drive. She asked why these parking lots are not part of the plan. She stated that we do need density and affordable housing in Cambridge. She stated that building will be there for at least 20+ years. She stated that she will not be able to live or raise a family in Cambridge. She offered her support for the postal workers.

Sylvia Rozwadowska-Shah, stated that she is in opposition to the 19-story building in Central Square. She stated that the City Council should work in the best interest of city residents and not in the best interest of developers and their profits. She stated that she does support mixed use buildings but these

buildings should be no taller than 12 stories. She stated that she does not want her city to start following uncontrolled development like she has observed in China.

Pebble Gifford, 15 Hilliard Street, stated that she has been serving on various committees in Harvard Square for many years. She stated that Harvard Square is now a historic neighborhood district. She stated that 14 million tourists per year come to Harvard Square. It is the engine of the Cambridge tourism industry. She stated that poor signage is not good and she asked that the signs be modified.

John Ratliffe spoke in opposition to Committee Report #2. He stated that planning cannot be done one parcel at a time. He stated that you cannot solve the problem of affordable housing one parcel at a time. The 40 units that may come from this project will create in the building that goes up, a market drive to raise the price of surrounding housing so that we will lose more than the 40 units we gain. The only way to address the crisis is by planning and working out a plan that utilizes all of the available resources such as the parking lots to create many more units of public housing in that same area and to prohibit labs.

Penny Barnes Leonard stated that as it relates to the Tokyo Restaurant site, she asked that if it is investigated it is important to look at the context of the site itself and the flooding projections for the parkway. She stated that she knows the owner is proposing to make an extension of the auto bay on that side. She stated that regarding Committee Report #2, she stated that she would like the City Council to push for more community amenities. She stated that she was disappointed that there was not discussion on the proposal of Councillor Carlone. She stated that this would have achieved more affordable housing and would have met a lot of goals.

CONSENT AGENDA

- # 1 Adopted 9 – 0 – 0.
- # 2 Placed on file
- # 8 Adopted 9 – 0 – 0

NON CONSENT AGENDA

3 Here insert Agenda # 3 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen commented on the work of the Mothers Out Front and the City. He stated that as the contract between the City and TransCanada lapses the City is looking into better options. The Request for Proposals will go out in late Spring and he wanted to know if there was enough time when the proposals come back, are vetted by the City Council and policy ramifications if this lapses. City Manager Rossi stated that he feels there will be an award in July and there will be enough time to make an informed decision.

Vice Mayor Benzan asked the City Manager to address the issue of renewable energy investments made by TransCanada. City Manager Rossi stated that it is his intention to hire a broker who will guide the City through the process. This is an open process and he is looking for a quality experience to help the City make these decisions around clean energy. He does not know what all the mitigating factors will be. He noted that the City has staff who can analyze these decisions. He is confident that the City will get a good product from this process and that the City will be in a good position. Vice Mayor Benzan stated that TransCanada could meet the City of Cambridge's renewable energy needs but this is being put out to bid. Mr. Rossi stated that the TransCanada is attempting to notify the City that there may be renewable energy issues that the City may not be aware of. He stated that when the City scopes out the kind of renewable energy that it is interested in the City will evaluate the proposals.

Councillor Cheung spoke about the percentage of renewable energy and understanding that not all renewables are the same. He stated that he appreciates the inclusion of municipal aggregation. This is important because long term this means more renewable energy in the homes of residents. He wanted clarification that a broker will be hired before a new contract is signed. City Manager responded in the affirmative. Councillor Cheung stated that if the City ever got to a point where it was net positive and homeowners sell their energy back to the grid. He wanted the broker to think about the City being a net producer of energy. Mr. Rossi stated that this will be discussed with the broker but he was unsure if this would be part of this contract. He stated that the staff is very motivated to head in this direction. The staff is willing to unite the City and the community to build a bigger army to move forward in these areas. He stated that the questions raised by Councillor Cheung will be examined in the process.

3 Placed on file.

4 Here insert Agenda # 4 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen stated that he was invited by first generation immigrant students at CRLS and he commented on the questions that were being asked by these students included violence, retribution and inclusion. He noted that people are feeling so disconnected. He wanted all to think about how to improve civic engagement for all. He stated that the practical questions raised in the report are good. He stated that the report clearly explained that this will require home rule legislation. He stated that it was favorable to forward this proposal in this direction. He question how much of an administrative problem this would be. Ms. Ford, Executive Director the Election Commission, stated that there would have to be two separate voting lists. One for legal citizens and one for the legal or determined illegal immigrants, depending on how this is defined. The voter registration system is provided by the state and this may also have to be separated. A software program may be needed that includes immigrants. This could be a headache. She spoke about the communication between the City and Immigration. She informed the City Council that Immigration contacts the Election Commission to determine if certain people are eligible to vote. She stated that this would not be outsourced, but there may be a need for more employees. The Election Commission Office may need to be separated into two separate divisions. Councillor Mazen commented on the fact that there have been no substantive legal challenges. He stated that if the City gets through the home rule process there may be a legal challenge. He asked if the City should proceed with a home rule petition on this matter. City Manager noted that an organized campaign would be needed to talk to the state legislators. He further stated that the state legislators look at a home rule petition to see how overwhelming the support is. The City would have to go to discuss this issue with the representatives in the legislature to explain why this is important and why the community feels so strongly about this matter.

Mayor Maher suggested that this matter be referred to the Government Operations, Rules and Claims Committee for a hearing that the City Council would have on this subject. Councillor Mazen stated that he would like to hear from his colleagues on this subject.

Councillor Cheung stated that he would favor this being referred to the Government Operations, Rules and Claims Committee. He further stated that the participatory budgeting process shows the City's values are more progressive than what is allowed under state law. The participatory budgeting process allowed anyone twelve years or older to vote, regardless of their immigration status.

Vice Mayor Benzan stated that at the federal level it appears that it is not the political will to fix the broken immigration system. If a pathway is created to citizenship for the immigrant community then

these conversations become unnecessary. He believes that the Cambridge delegation will be supportive of this. The problem in this country is that there is no well to fix the system. He noted that two communities, Maryland and New York, which allowed their undocumented immigrants and their documented immigrants to vote in local elections find that the immigrants do not vote. He asked why this is. Ms. Ford stated that when first allowed there was a large amount of people but has lessened overtime. The votes was initially effected by 29% and went down to 0%. Vice Mayor Benzan noted that in general voter turnout is low in municipal elections. He stated that the problem being tackled is how immigrant families engaged are. He stated that in Massachusetts undocumented immigrants can obtain insurance but cannot get a drivers' license. He stated that referring this to Government Operations, Rules and Claims Committee and moving this at the state legislature will be very difficult. Cambridge is a more liberal community than others in the state.

4 Placed on file and referred to the Government Operations, Rules and Claims Committee on motion of Councillor Mazen.

5 Here insert Agenda # 5 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen noted that the report is very informative. He stated that it is his hope that reports such as this come back to the City Council with an implementation process. He stated that he assumed that when a City Councillor submitted a policy order and the research is done that the intention is implementation. He wanted to know how to get this implemented. City Manager Rossi stated that the Affordable Housing Trust is dealing with these issues. He stated that he would have the Affordable Housing Trust make some solid recommendations and then forward them to the City Council for discussion in the Housing Committee. Ms. Farooq stated that the reasons there was no action item is that this is a complex matter. There are many tradeoffs. If a local preference is created for City employees in a pool of units available there will be more competition for the same number of units. What is a clear preference now does not remain a clear preference. This is a policy decision for the City Council to make on whether the City Council wants this pursued further.

Councillor Cheung stated that this issue came up at the Roundtable with the Affordable Housing Trust. This was to allow employees preference in the City where they work. He noted that a pie which is too small is being further cut up. It would be good if there were enough affordable housing being created so that the Affordable Housing Trust could consider who is next in the pie for consideration.

Vice Mayor Benzan stated that he understands that this is complicated. He believes that the most important issue is how we protect the families who are in the City now. He questioned if someone lived in the City, moved and then returned to the City how is their residency established and for how long. He wants to ensure that this program really works for Cambridge residents.

Councillor Simmons stated that she appreciated the report but she felt that it needs further discussion. She stated that there should one conversation in the Housing Committee around eligibility criteria. She stated how the City Council wants to address the eligibility criteria in the inclusionary zoning. The Nexus Study will be completed soon. She commented about making recommendations that make sense going forward. She is concerned about conflict being created among people who have had preference and then it is gone. She stated that important policy decision need to be made in the future. She stated that this needs to be part of the inclusionary zoning discussion.

5 Placed on file and referred to the Housing Committee on motion of Councillor Simmons.

6 Here insert Agenda # 6 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Simmons noted that the two options in the report. She thanked the City for the bus shelter at the corner of Brookline and Erie Streets. She wanted the City to launch a pilot program on the bus shelters.

6 Placed on file.

7 Here insert Agenda # 7 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen noted that this is a great start to a great process. He spoke about the important of engaging the public in the vetting and hiring process. He is hoping that in this process that promises can be extracted as to where this master planning intends to go. He was pleased to see that civic engagement and economic development was part of the comprehensive plan. He hopes that this process will look at small businesses and ground floor retail eco system which is not part of the planning process. He commented that unless a business owner is wealthy it is difficult to open a ground floor retail business. He stated that the data analysis and visualization needs to be stronger. He wanted language stating that the master planners work visually with the stakeholders. He suggested working with MIT on research and planning. He wanted the deliverables on the project roadmap engage the precedents and best practices comprehensively. He wanted to know the comparable that the master planner are looking at to see what communities are doing planning right.

Councillor McGovern suggested that there be communication about an update on the master plan. Mr. Rossi stated that a good active website would provide this information. He noted that this will be a long process and that there will be developments that will come forward while this process is going on. He stated that he does not want to wait three years to get more housing. This process was never meant to be a moratorium on development. He stated that when there are public meetings the City has to ensure that the audio, the presentation and the outreach. This does not do justice to the work done by the City. He wanted to make sure that there are translators, childcare and that the printed material is in different languages. He stated that the early childhood task force must be included in the key planning initiatives.

Councillor Carlone stated that he appreciated that the Alewife Study is priority number one. He stated that Central Square should be priority number two. He noted that the C2 analysis has never been put into a physical plan. Future developments can be evaluated on this. He stated that having a plan gives a sense of direction. The finished product can be an urban design plan. He wanted each of the design strategies rated. He further stated that opportunities and constraints, both hard and soft need to be defined.

Vice Mayor Benzan was pleased that the master plan would focus on Alewife because of all the unique issues in this area. He commented that New Street should continue and a road created that will take one across the tracks to Route 2. This would require working with the state and the private sector to accomplish this. He spoke about creating public parking garages possibly in conjunction with the developers. He also wanted thought given to carving out space for early childhood education as new developments are proposed. He stated that he hears from constituents who are concern about street construction and curb extensions. Area Four streets are in disrepair and this is the area the bears the most burden with development. He wanted more resources dedicated to the streets and sidewalks in Area Four. He wants to understand from the master planning process what is the necessity of the sidewalk and curb extensions. Is this necessity backed up with data? He stated that the narrowing of Western Avenue is creating congestion.

Councillor Kelley commented that the master plan is a great discussion to have. He stated that the master plan will not solve all the problems and that the master plan will need constant updating and changing. He wanted the table of uses looked at as to how it is used. He stated that auto data from the new residences at Alewife is needed as well as demographic data. He noted that a demographic shift will be empty nesters moving back to the City. He stated that any plan must have demographics running through it. He stated that urban mobility will be changing. The future cannot be predicted.

Mayor Maher stated that the citywide comprehensive planning update sent out was perfect. This is a great way to keep people informed about how this process is unfolding.

7 Placed on file.

FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET OVERVIEW

9 Here insert Agenda # 9 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor McGovern made the following comments on the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget.

General Highlights

- 1) The FY16 Operating Budget is \$545.9 million, which is a 2.83% increase over the FY15 adjusted budget. It calls for a moderate increase of 4.54% in the property tax levy.
- 2) Included in the Budget is a 2.4% cost of living increase for employees, a 0% increase in health insurance, and a 5.85% increase in pensions.
- 3) Twelve new full-time positions will allow for appropriate operating growth to meet additional program needs. Positions include a Net Zero Planner, a Housing Planner, an Organics Recycling Manager, a Public Works Landscape Administrator, a DHSP Community Engagement Team Leader, a STEAM Coordinator, a Parking Control Officer, and a Licensed Social Worker for Police, and new IT positions.
- 4) The City Manager will speak in more detail about NEW INITIATIVES such as:
 - Sustainability - Net Zero, Climate Change, and Georgetown Energy Prize
 - Curbside Organics Collection expansion
 - Steam Coordination Office
 - Domestic & Gender Based Violence Prevention Initiative
 - Cambridge Leadership Initiative
 - E-Gov Projects
- 5) The FY16 Capital Budget totals \$85.3 million and includes:
 - a. Water and sewer reconstruction projects,
 - b. Street and sidewalk reconstruction,
 - c. Construction of the King Open/Cambridge St. School & Community Complex,
 - d. Information Technology – 2nd year of E-Gov Initiatives
 - FY15 \$3.8 million & FY16 \$3.45 million, and
 - e. Participatory Budgeting winners – \$528,000

- 100 new trees and tree wells in low-canopy neighborhoods (\$119,400)
- 20 new laptops for the Community Learning Center (\$27,000)
- Bilingual books for children learning English (\$7,000)
- Public toilet in Central Square (\$320,000)
- 8 bike repair stations (\$12,000)
- Free public Wi-Fi in 6 outdoor locations (\$42,000)

CITY MANAGER RICHARD ROSSI HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING ITEMS RELATING TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET. HE STATED THAT THE BUDGET DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REDESIGNED. IT WILL BE AN EASIER DOCUMENT TO READ. HE SPOKE ABOUT THE ENTHUSIASM OF THE PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING PROCESS.

I am pleased to submit for your consideration the proposed Operating and Capital Budgets for the City of Cambridge for FY16 as well as the proposed FY17-20 Operating and Capital Plans.

This Operating Budget of \$545.9 million represents an increase of \$15 million, or 2.8%, over the FY15 Adjusted Budget. The proposed Capital Budget is \$85.3 million.

The proposed **Operating Budget** of \$545.9 million includes the following:

- A total property tax levy of \$357 million to support the General Fund Operating and Capital Budget. This is an increase of \$15.5 million, or 4.5%, from the FY15 property tax levy.
 - The actual tax levy is determined in the fall as part of the property tax and classification process. The City can make adjustments to budgeted revenues as part of the process. As in past years, it is anticipated that the City may be able to use increased non-property tax revenues at a higher level than what is included in the FY16 Budget, once actual FY15 receipts and final state aid figures are known.
- A 2.4% cost of living adjustment (COLA) for all non-union employees and for those unions with settled contracts. A 0% increase in health insurance, 0% increase in dental, and 5.85% increase related to pensions.
- Twelve full-time positions have been added to the FY16 budget that will allow for appropriate operating growth to meet additional program needs throughout the city. Positions include a Net Zero Planner, a Housing Planner, an Organics Recycling Manager, a Public Works Landscape Administrator, a DHSP Community Engagement Team Leader, a STEAM Coordinator, a Parking Control Officer, and a Licensed Social Worker for Police, and new IT positions.
- Collaboration between the City and School fiscal staffs resulted in a successful school budget process. Recognizing the importance of this process, and my commitment to public education, the Superintendent and I worked closely to balance the School's budget. The City increased property tax support to schools to 6.27%. The School Committee adopted the School Department budget of \$163.9 million.

- A 0% increase in the water rate and a 6.8% increase in the sewer rate, resulting in a 4.9% increase in the combined rate. This is the fifth consecutive year that the City has been able to produce a 0% increase in the water rate.
- The City Debt Stabilization Fund will provide \$1.3 million to cover debt service costs.
- The City will recommend using \$9 million in free cash to lower the property tax levy increase, which is consistent with the City's financial plan.

NEW INITIATIVES:

- Executive: Domestic & Gender Based Violence Prevention Initiative - This group is currently undertaking a comprehensive citywide needs assessment to provide the City with a clear understanding of existing resources as well as what would be necessary to improve the City's prevention and intervention response to domestic and gender-based violence.
- Executive: Cambridge Leadership Initiative – the City will build the cultural competency skills of employees and enhance the leadership capacity of leaders, managers, and supervisors throughout all City departments.
- Executive: Citizen Committee on Civic Unity - The Committee's work will include engaging the public and facilitating constructive dialogue on race, class, religion, sexual orientation, income, physical ability, age, gender, and other issues to promote equity, fairness, and unity within the City organizational structure and the broader Cambridge community.
- IT: E-Gov Projects -
 - Launching the City's online Open Data Portal
 - Redesigning the City's website
 - Implementing online permitting for Public Works
 - Increasing capacity of City Wi-Fi service
 - Undertaking major infrastructure projects to transition to Microsoft 365, install PeopleSoft upgrades, implement email in the cloud, implement security enhancements at City Hall, and upgrade the City firewall
- Community Development: Net Zero - CDD will hire a Net Zero Planner to help implement the recommendations from the Getting to Net Zero Task Force. The recommendations include strategies for increasing energy efficiency of both existing buildings and new construction as well as for greening the energy supply.
- Community Development: Climate Change - The City will embark on an estimated two-year process to develop a climate change preparedness and resilience plan to address risks from increasing temperatures, precipitation, and sea level rise.
- Community Development: Georgetown Energy Prize - Cambridge is one of 50 competitors for the \$5,000,000 Georgetown University Energy Prize, which challenges towns, cities, and counties to rethink their energy use and implement creative strategies to increase electric and

natural gas efficiency. In FY16, the City will reach broadly into the community to educate and inspire residents and businesses to engage in the competition.

- Community Development: Connect Kendall - CDD conducted a public planning and design competition to develop an open space framework for the Kendall Square area.
- Public Works: Curbside Organics Collection - the City will expand curbside collection of household food scraps (“organics”) to the entire Monday collection route. Eligible residences include single-family homes and multi-family buildings with 12 units or less and must have City trash service.
- Water: Variable frequency drives will be installed on the raw water pumps to achieve significant energy savings.
- Electrical: LED light Conversion - the second phase of the LED conversion will include decorative streetlights and park fixtures. Once funding is determined, I will submit a Free Cash appropriation.
- Human Services: With support from the Kids’ Council, DHSP’s Community Engagement Team developed a citywide outreach and engagement training program called *Making Connections: A Community Engagement Training Program for Cambridge*. It is an outreach and community engagement skills training program focused on 24 core skills necessary to effectively engage residents in activities and services available in the city.
- Human Services: Steam Coordination Office – DHSP will develop a network of learning and internship opportunities for students. DHSP will hire a STEAM Coordinator to work with City departments, the schools, companies, and higher education partners to expand opportunities for students to gain STEAM skills and exposure to STEAM-related careers. The Coordinator will also develop ways to market opportunities to families to ensure diverse learners have access to a wide variety of educational, work-based, and enrichment opportunities.
- Library: Self Services - The Main Library entrance will be redesigned to allow for expanded self-checkout and the implementation of self-service holds.

The proposed **Capital Budget** of \$85,276,290 includes the following:

- \$55 million in continued sewer and storm water projects which include the Agassiz neighborhood, Alewife watershed, and Area 4 neighborhood; \$8 million in streets and sidewalks; \$4 million for the reconstruction of “The Eliot Loop” in Harvard Square; and \$5 million for the comprehensive City buildings/facilities improvement plan.
- \$11 million in bond proceeds will be used to fund design and construction services for the King Open and Cambridge Street Upper School & Community Complex and \$4.2 million is included to replace the roof at the Kennedy Longfellow School.
- \$5.5 million in Pay-As-You-Go/property taxes includes \$3.5 million in IT projects \$528,000 for the winning Participatory Budgeting projects and \$1.5 million for other projects.

- Water service charges of \$4,900,000 to cover all water-related capital.

OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSION

FY14 was another remarkable financial year for the City. Our financial practices have left the City with substantial reserves, including \$160,500,000 in free cash and \$134,000,000 in excess levy capacity.

It is anticipated that the City will also end FY15 in a very strong financial position.

The City has used \$33,430,000 in free cash to date. Major appropriations include \$12,650,000 to lower the property tax rate, a \$12,000,000 transfer to the Debt Stabilization Fund, \$6,000,000 to cover winter 2014-2015 snowstorm expenses, and \$1,500,000 for the feasibility study at the King Open and Cambridge Upper Street School. The City is also looking into acquiring land for a Public Works / municipal facility, which will be funded through free cash.

We will continue to use our five-year financial and capital plan, debt, and reserve policies and the City Council goals as a guide in our long-term planning to maintain stability and predictability in our budgeting and financial planning processes.

Major priorities that will impact the budget in the near-term include construction of the King Open Elementary/Cambridge Street Upper School, Citywide planning efforts, redevelopment of the Foundry Building, and recommendations from the Early Childhood and Net Zero Task Forces.

While overall economic conditions are steady, there are some uncertainties we will be watching in the next fiscal year – most notably, the impact of possible federal and state budget reductions.

The long-term outlook for Cambridge continues to be very strong as long as we continue to efficiently manage operations. This has been confirmed by our continued AAA bond rating. We have been able to absorb operating and programmatic costs associated with expanding services, cover increased salary and fringe benefit costs, and manage debt service costs with an aggressive capital plan.

I believe that the initiatives and spending priorities recommended in this budget submission reflect not only the goals of the City Council, but also the priorities of the residents and taxpayers of Cambridge. He stated that the budget has grown; programs and employees have increased and the City has responded to the City Council about the important issues in the coming year.

Councillor McGovern spoke about the undesignated fund balances of \$160 million. He stated that the City Council's responsibility to fund programs now but to also think about the future of the City and the future programs. He asked if the City were not in such a financial stable situation how long would it be before services would have to be cut. This is a good perspective for the public to have. Mr. Rossi stated that if the City is to be successful a plan is needed to replenish the undesignated fund, expenditures need to be managed and there needs to be an aggressive accumulation of revenue to manage what is spent out every year. This year to date \$33 million has been spent.

Mr. DePasquale stated that in fiscal year 2010 there was \$89 million and last year the City had \$160 million. This was accumulated with hard work. He stated that free cash has to be replenished and it needs to be spent when it is needed to be spent. He stated that this year \$33 million was spent and it does not include the \$6 million allocated for the Foundry. This does not include land for a new Public

Works Facility. This fund helps the City address needs as they arise, such as snow removal. He stated that with the IT initiative \$3.8 million was taken last year and \$3.5 million this year from free cash. He stated that free cash is used for onetime items and it is an important part of the budget. He stated that this may go down to \$130 million which will be similar to the fiscal year 2012 number. He stated that he does not want the rate to be artificially lowered. He stated that over the last nine years the City has had an average levy increase of 4.4%. This year it will be 4.5%. There is a \$13 million base build up for free cash. This will be replaced hopefully even with the large E-Gov numbers. He stated that with the success of the Participatory Budget program this is not a onetime use and \$528,000 has been put into property taxes this year. Also twelve new positions were added this year, \$528,000 for Participatory Budgeting and still the City is at a rate increase less than the five year average. There is increased revenue received from building permits but it is unclear how long this will continue. The City has a plan that it manages and the rating agencies accept the plan. Mr. Rossi noted that a new school is no longer a \$30-\$40 million; they are now \$100 million.

Councillor Carlone stated that all this needs to be celebrated. He applauded the new budget format. He commented that the summaries in the budget help enormously. He stated that in the surveys the number one issue was affordable housing. He is hoping that in addition to all the programs that there will be an allocation for affordable housing in the budget. He stated that affordable housing is the number one goal and no money is being put into the budget for it.

Mr. Rossi stated that these decisions will have to be made. These decisions will affect the tax rate. The City needs to think less about growth in other areas if it is looking for growth in this area. He stated that Cambridge is a fragile community in terms of taxes. This is about choices. He stated that the CPA funds leverages millions more in funding. He stated that the City has saved 808 Memorial Drive and is about to save Briston Arms. The City has saved the expiring use buildings. The City has not lost units while affordable housing is built. He feels what the City has achieved thus far is great. More can be done. Councillor Carlone stated that this is the reason to direct City funds into affordable housing. He stated that the City is falling behind and the demand for affordable housing in Cambridge is increasing. Mr. Rossi stated that it would be a good exercise to go through the budget and state what the City could do without. Councillor Carlone stated that he would like to see a vote on the ballot to increase the amount of money used from free cash to reduce the taxes.

Councillor Kelley stated that he would cut the City Council assistants. He stated that the housing challenge is an issue that many communities are facing. He commented about the amount for education and the amount for charter schools. He stated that in the future the City is going to have to ask about the results of the charter schools instead of just giving the money. He stated that in future budget more educational data needs to be seen.

Councillor Cheung commented for the last five years the budget has gotten better every year. He stated that every year the budget addresses resident needs and the requests of the City Council. He noted that the loss of David Holland to the Budget Department was a great loss. He stated that the reason that the Budget Overview was moved to a Monday night was so that the public could hear about the budgetary process. He stated that the Participatory Budgeting that was just revealed is in the current budget. He acknowledged the changes in city departments due to the EGov process. He highlighted programs such as composting program, early childhood programs and the net zero program.

CALENDAR

No action having been taken on Calendar Item Number One, the same being a charter right exercised by Councillor Toomey on an application from Ronald Smith requesting a curb cut at the premises numbered

139 Charles Street; said petition has received approval from Inspectional Services, Traffic, Parking and Transportation, Historical Commission, Public Works and a response from the neighborhood association – this item was –

1 Placed on file under Rule Nineteen.

2 Councillor Cheung made a motion to place Calendar Item Number Two on file.

Councillor Kelley stated that this was a zoning petition to change the zoning for a building in East Cambridge. This had nothing to do with planning. This petition is not a good faith attempt to discuss planning. Zoning is zoning and it is done through a process. He stated that it is wrong to use zoning this way. This should not be used as a political tool outside of the planning process.

Councillor Toomey requested a roll call. He stated that the same method should be used to defeat this petition as was done at a previous meeting on a similar petition.

Councillor Cheung stated that the difference between this petition and the previous one is that this is not an issue that is before the City Council where the other petition is before the City Council. He stated he is tired of the City Council stating that it supports workers and this plays into how unions are fighting for minimum wage, benefits for workers and what have been described as Cambridge's values and the City Council has to take a stand on this. He stated that these are the rules that the City Council has to abide by. He commented on the order adopted by the City Council regarding Callahan Construction. He stated that in Boston Callahan workers are union; they are not union in Cambridge. He stated that not holding developers to Cambridge standards are bad for the residents and exacerbates the problem of not allowing people to earn a living and have affordable housing. It is unfair to the developers who abide by Cambridge standards.

Councillor Mazen stated that he felt that this is a suitable forum to brooches issues such as this and to send it along for further in-depth discussion. He stated that promoting policy order such as this is reasonable. He would rather look into this in more detail rather than defeat it. He stated that if there are objections to the policy order now is the time to get a temperature check on this issue.

Councillor Toomey stated that this issue on First Street has been before the East Cambridge Planning Team many times. The neighbors have worked to make the First Street corridor a more livable, business friendly area. He stated that this order would penalize innocent property owners. He stated that First Street has been a blight and it is making a comeback with the work of the residents and the Community Development Department. He stated that there is a great design for the area. This design will eliminate a fire hazard created by the mattress company. He stated that the City Council had oversight when Callahan Construction built a building on CambridgePark Drive. He supports unions.

Councillor Kelley stated that zoning petitions do not just involve the City Council. A zoning petition is forwarded to the Community Development Department for study by the staff and the Planning Board holds a hearing and reports back to the City Council on the petition. He stated that there are many parts to the process. The discussions are important but the zoning process is not the mechanism to have these discussions. He stated that this is not respectful to the process or the Planning Board.

Councillor Carlone stated that the existing zoning states it should be 25,000 square feet and this proposal is ten times greater. This site is six acres. He stated that this proposal is heavy handed. He

noted that this proposal affects other sites that may be in planning. He noted that there may be another way to do this. He stated that labs do not belong next to residences.

Mayor Maher moved the motion by Councillor Toomey to call the question on the order as submitted which reads as follows:

(HERE INSERT ORDER FOR CALENDAR # 2)

YEAS:	Councillors Cheung and Simmons	- 2
NAYS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 6
ABSENT:	None	- 0
PRESENT:	Councillor Carlone	- 1

and the order –
Failed of adoption.

3-5 No action taken.

APPLICATIONS AND PETITIONS

- # 1 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members on the motion of Vice Mayor Benzan.
- # 2 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members on the motion of Vice Mayor Benzan.
- # 3 Charter Right exercised by Councillor Kelley.
- # 4 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members on the motion of Vice Mayor Benzan.
- # 5 Referred to the City Manager.

CONSENT COMMUNICATIONS

1 – 59 Placed on file on motion of Councillor Simmons.

CONSENT RESOLUTIONS

#1-39 On a motion by Councillor Simmons to approve all the consent resolutions and to make them unanimously sponsored on adoption – all consent resolutions were adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

CONSENT POLICY ORDERS

- # 1 – 5 Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
- # 8 -9 Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
- #13 Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

- # 1 Report accepted and placed on file by Councillor Simmons.
- # 2 Report accepted and placed on file.

Councillor Carlone stated that all want affordable housing, but the City needs to step up. He stated that there is no comprehensive housing plan, there is no adopted plan for Central Square, no analysis for the economic development costs for Central Square. He stated that the Planning Board has not reported on the Normandy Twining proposal. The Inclusionary Nexus Study and the affordable housing percentages has not happened. He stated that the issue is all about land value. He stated that

by passing this proposal it raises the land value of the surrounding area which is counterproductive for affordable housing. He asked where are the studies supporting this dramatic up zoning and what has the Community Development Department given the City Council. He stated that the door has been opened for 6.5 FAR. He stated that this will continue throughout the City. He stated that there so many questions on this zoning proposal. He stated that he is concerned about the impacts of this zoning.

Councillor Mazen stated that development and change in the squares is important and any kind of planning that can be done to further this is necessary. The City Council cannot undermine the planning process yet the City Council wants the square to be coherent and to extract the maximum public benefit. He stated that in the future it would be great to negotiate together and stronger and to get more for the City of Cambridge, without derailing the process. He felt a slight pause or another meeting would be beneficial to determine if the maximum benefit is being received by the City. He asked if the City understood the developers other holdings and what are their plans and the context of the City lots. He wanted to extract more from developers for the public good.

Mayor Maher clarified that the petition expires on May 27, 2015 and earliest that it can come before the City Council for ordination is May 18, 2015.

Councillor McGovern stated that he felt that the petition is not being jammed through. There have been three Ordinance hearings on the petition. The petition is following the normal course.

Councillor Mazen stated that there is more public context that could be established if there were an additional hearing if the developer showed plans and plans for the city lots and there may even be a public benefit that could be extracted. He is voting no from the position of a negotiator. He stated that the City does not to say yes now given the timeline, opportunities and benefits. He wanted to extract more benefit from the developer.

Councillor Kelley noted that there are another three weeks on this proposal. He stated that if this is not passed the developer may put something on the site that the City would not want. He stated that there is a down side to negotiating on this proposal. He appreciates trying to get as good a deal for the City and the residents as possible but it is unclear where the best deal lies.

Councillor Carlone commented that the East Cambridge Shopping Center went through twenty-six different designs in the negotiation phase. He stated that it is the most successful shopping complex in greater Boston. He noted that this building will be the largest in Central Square and this warrants great concern. He stated that he believes that this is bad for Cambridge.

Vice Mayor Benzan moved the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinances be passed to a second reading, which reads as follows:

(HERE INSERT FIRST PUBLICATION NO. 3355)

On this question the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Cheung, Kelley, McGovern, Simmons, Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 7
NAYS:	Councillors Carlone and Mazen	- 2
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the proposed amendment was –
Passed to a second reading.

COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS FROM OTHER CITY OFFICERS

1 Referred to the Finance Committee.

NON CONSENT POLICY ORDERS

6 Here insert Policy Order # 6 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Simmons asked Councillor Kelley what was his intention with the Policy Order.

Councillor Kelley stated that it is for the City Council to have a process to review the City Manager's nominations to the Cambridge Housing Authority and the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority. He stated that the City Council should review the nominees to ensure that they have the skill that the board needs. He stated that having this focused discussion on what these two boards do would benefit the City Council. Councillor Simmons was informed that this is change to the City Council Rules. Mayor Maher explained that this could be referred to the Government Operations, Rules and Claims Committee for a hearing before the rule is changed.

Councillor Toomey stated that the Policy Order submitted by Councillor Kelley makes sense. He stated that every time the appointments come before the City Council there is this discussion. This order formalizes the process; it does not need to go to the Government Operations, Rules and Claims Committee. He stated that a simple rules change is sufficient. He supports this being placed on the table for one week and adopted at the next City Council meeting.

Councillor McGovern spoke about the responsibility of the City Council Committees and the City Council having more input into the appointments. He envisioned the process as the City Manager's appointee appearing before a City Council committee and then the City Council vote to confirm the appointment. This is a larger communication of what the committees do. This conversation feels like it is tied to the person rather than the appointment. He supported the rule change and wanted a deeper discussion about the roles of the committees and their responsibilities.

Councillor Kelley explained that this Policy Order is due because the City Council has been in this discussion many times. When the appointment is before the City Council it appears not to be the best place to discuss the appointee. It is about the appointee. It is about does the person fit the need. He stated that he wanted to see a person on the Cambridge Housing Authority with a lot of educational skills and who understands how to make education work for someone from a less privileged background. The City Council needs to discuss the skill set need for the board. It is important that this go to the committees contained in the policy order.

6 Placed on Unfinished Business for one week on a motion by Councillor Simmons.

7 Here insert Policy Order # 7 read by Vice Mayor Benzan. Councillor Mazen stated that sound mapping may be related to studying light pollution. He asked if this could be added to the order so that both are researched and described concurrently. He wondered if the complaints were related by geography, the type of light and sound pollution or by the demographics of the complainant. He stated that this information would be interesting even if not prepared to move on light pollution as quickly.

Councillor Kelley stated that there is a Light Pollution Task Force working on whether the zoning should be changed on light pollution. He agreed that the City needs to focus on more than it does. He stated that noise involves moving things and the noise from car radios with loud volume can be bothersome late at night. He did not want to blend noise and light pollution. He suggested that light pollution be addressed with a separate order and have a discussion on both at a later time.

Councillor Mazen stated that he thought the issues were related because of the solutions proposed.

Councillor Kelley noted that to do something about noise will be really challenging.

7 Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

#10 Here insert Original Policy Order #10 read by Vice Mayor Benzan. Councillor Simmons spoke about the continued efforts to do the cleanup in Area IV because of the vested interest in the neighborhood. She stated that the tree wells have a large amount of dog feces and dog owners are not cleaning up after their dogs. She stated that a solution could be if the City worked at making the tree wells more attractive dog owners may be inclined not to curb their dogs at the tree wells. The idea is to pilot a program that creates neighborhood pride as well as being a deterrent to curbing dogs and to trash being discarded. She stated how a neighborhood looks indicates how the City feels about the neighborhood. It is important to adopt the order to allow the City to help beautify the neighborhood. She noted that there was tree ambassador program previously that did not progress well.

Vice Mayor Benzan made a motion to amend the order to add Windsor, Pine and Washington Streets to the order.

The question now came on the amendment and on a voice vote the amendment –
Carried.

The question now came on adoption of the order as amended which reads as follows:
(HERE COPY AMENDED ORDER NUMBER TEN)

The order was –

Adopted as amended by the affirmative vote of nine members.

#11 Here insert Policy Order # 11 read by Vice Mayor Benzan. Councillor Simmons informed the City Council that Staples does not pay what the Post Office pays its workers. She stated that the Post Office still has the responsibility for work that they have no control of. This weakens the organization for wage equity.

#11 Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

#12 Here insert Policy Order # 12 read by Vice Mayor Benzan. Councillor Toomey stated that this this was taken up at the legislature and no action was taken. This matter is no longer before the House Ways and Means and it is not part of the house budget at this time.

Councillor Cheung made a motion to withdraw Policy Order # 12 and hearing no objection the order was –
Withdrawn with unanimous consent.

LATE RESOLUTIONS

The following late resolutions were now considered and made unanimously sponsored:

#40-45 The resolutions were adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Councillor McGovern the meeting adjourned at 11:27 PM.

A list of documents and other exhibits used at the meeting:

City Manager's Agenda

City Council Agenda

CD of meeting